DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 676 TE 000 882

By- Donelson, Kenneth L.

Censorship and the Teaching of English: A Few Problems and Fewer Solutions.

Pub Date Oct 68

Note- 15p.

Journal Cit- Statement: The Journal of the Colorado Language Arts Society; v4 n1 p5-15, 18-20 Oct 1968

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.85

Descriptors- *Censorship, Educational Policy, *English Instruction, Literary Discrimination, Literature, Literature Appreciation, Moral Issues, Moral Values, Novels, Political Issues, Reading Materials, *Reading Material Selection, School Community Relationship, Secondary Schools

The ultimate judgment in book selection for classroom use must rest with the teacher who should be able to defend his choices on the basis of literary and moral values. Censorship occurs whenever such choices are thwarted by the community. To deal effectively with censorship, the English teacher should know (1) that rational men throughout history have defended censorship on moral, political, and philosophical grounds; (2) that although many censors defend their own judgments emotionally, other censors are philosophical and rational; (3) that censorship is objectionable and the necessity for it unconfirmed; and (4) that goals in teaching literature are enjoyment, understanding, knowledge about contrasting values, and appreciation of art. English departments should establish book selection committees, demand professionalism from their members, inform the public about policies, devise a procedure for handling censorship cases, and remain calm when the censor appears. (JS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED0 24676

Statement

The Journal of the Colorado Language Arts Society

(Member of the NCTE Information Exchange Agreement)

Volume 4 **October, 1968** **Number 1**

TE 000 882

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Focus on Censorship

Responsibility for Relevance
Alton Barbour 3

Censorship and the Teaching of English:
A Few Problems and Fewer Solutions
Kenneth L. Donelson 5

Censorship in Colorado: A Survey Report
H. T. Spetnagel Jr 21

Book Selection and Censorship
Robert F. Hogan 25

Program for October 11 Conference 16

MANUSCRIPTS

Articles are invited on topics related to the field of English and concerning any aspect of the teaching of English — kindergarten through college. All correspondence should be addressed to Jerry E. Reed, Executive Secretary, 2644 South Krameria Street, Denver, Colorado 80222.

Dr. Donelson is Associate Professor in English at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

CENSORSHIP AND THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH: A FEW PROBLEMS AND FEWER SOLUTIONS

Kenneth L. Donelson

With some pain and a little amusement, I remember when censorship first touched me. I was in my second year of teaching in a small Iowa high school, I had just finished my last class of the day, I was tired, and I saw my superintendent smiling at me from the other end of the hall. My superintendent smiled for only one reason (he never smiled for any other that I ever knew) —trouble was brewing in his office, and the beaming smile and the beckoning finger hinted that I was part of the current brew.

I found the mother of one of my students waiting for me. Sincere, dedicated, moral, patriotic, religious, friendly, omniscient —in short, she was the summation of all that is noble about motherhood or dangerous about censorship. Alternately placating and admonishing, she confided that she had heard some unfavorable talk about me and the literature my students were reading, that she had determined to help me in any way she could, and that she certainly did not intend her remarks to be mistaken for censorship. After some motherly advice on the dangers of letting students read books like **A Farewell to Arms, 1984,** or **The Grapes of Wrath,** she concluded by asking me, "Why let children read material that tells them about the nastiness of the world? Why don't you encourage them to read some good, clean, happy literature?" Since I was unsure as only a second year teacher can be and since I was genuinely curious about what she considered "good, clean, happy literature," I asked if she had any titles she would like to recommend.

Yes, she most certainly would. She was happy to recommend several "good, clean, happy" books, among them **The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, The Odyssey, Macbeth,** and **Gulliver's Travels,** all presumably old, safe, classic, and antiseptic. According to

her standards, the classics were safe for children, irrespective of content or tone or intent; contemporary literature was unsafe and always suspect. A similar cautionary note, of course wholly unrelated to censorship, was sounded by Dr. Max Rafferty when he attacked **The Lord of the Flies** and **The Catcher in the Rye,** fondly quoting a letter labeling such material "dreadful, dreary recitals of sickness, sordidness, and sadism." After lamenting modern literature's inability to create memorable literary figures, Dr. Rafferty said:

> And please don't try to tell me that I'm being unduly impatient and that future generations will eventually immortalize the drably anonymous nonheroes of our current sex sagas. I just don't believe it. It didn't take that long for the Elizabethans to appreciate Ariel or the Victorians to embrace Tom Sawyer.[1]

Now whether Holden Caulfield or Piggy or Willie Loman or Winston Smith, all presumably "drably anonymous nonheroes" will be remembered by future generations is something no critic could presume to answer. Teachers do know that these characters do come alive for their students, and the books from which they come do offer perceptive commentaries about the nature and state of man, for good or ill. Contemporary society often badly misjudges a book, a case in point being one of Dr. Rafferty's examples. **Tom Sawyer** was excluded from the Denver Public Library and the children's room of the Brooklyn Library in 1876. The reason? The book set a "bad example for ingenuous youth."[2] The corrupting influence of **The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn** is even better known, Louisa May Alcott writing, "If Mr. Clemens cannot think of something better to tell our pure-minded lads and lassies, he had best stop writing for them."[3] Clearly some Victorians did not approve of Twain's work, which raises Twain in my eyes; it certainly does not lower his current literary reputation. But then several classics had a miserable contemporary press. Surely every English teacher is aware that **Gulliver's Travels** was not universally admired, nor **The Scarlet Letter,** nor **Pamela,** nor many other books we could list.

---

[1]Max Rafferty, "Output of Moderns Is Not Literature," **Arizona Republic,** March 5, 1967, Section C, page 3.

[2]Information about contemporary reactions to great books may be found in many books; one good, brief source is Anne Haight, **Banned Books** (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1955).

[3]Paul Blanshard, **The Right to Read: The Battle Against Censorship** (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955) page 141.

We can laugh at the oblique attempts at censorship, just as we can laugh when a fellow English teacher says, "Students are so naive and so sweet. Why give them the dirty side of life? They'll meet that soon enough. Let's keep children pure and innocent and uncontaminated as long as we can." Our laugh is well controlled, and maybe the laugh hurts a little, but we are too accustomed to stupid English teachers to be shocked. We can even laugh at some of the classical jokes of censorship. The irate parent in California who objected to the song "Swing the Shining Sickle" as Communist propaganda was a kindred soul to the Arizona parent who objected to the woodcuts of doves in **Good Morning, Miss Dove.** Why? Because the doves were clearly "Communist inspired." Not so well known is the Brooklyn school official who objected to the immorality of Longfellow's "The Building of the Ship." And what was his objection? To the fact that "the ship was pictured as 'leaping into the ocean's arms,'" and to the following lines which clearly appeal to our prurient interests.[4]

> How beautiful she is! How fair
> She lies within those arms, that press
> Her form with many a soft caress
> Of tenderness and watchful care!

Censorship, however, is never amusing to English teachers in the concrete and here, only in the abstract and there. When it hits, and that is almost inevitable, it is brightening and bewildering and frustrating. English teachers and librarians are intimidated or they hide or they play it safe, none of them professional or effective poses. That virtually any book may come under attack from the most obscure source for the most unlikely reason is almost a truism of English teaching, 1968. Granted, attempted censorship of certain titles could be foreseen—**The Catcher in the Rye, 1984, Brave New World, The Death of a Salesman, To Kill a Mockingbird, Black Like Me,** or **The Grapes of Wrath.** Stupid as censorship usually is, teachers using these books should be prepared to meet attacks. But who could have foreseen attempts in Arizona to censor **Cress Delahanty, J. B., Moby Dick, Wings of the Dove,** or **A Tale of Two Cities?**

Censorship represents a clear and present danger to the freedom of the English teacher to teach what he wishes, when he

---

[4]Frederic R. Hartz, "Obscenity, Censorship, and Youth," **Clearing House,** 36 (October, 1961), page 100.

wishes, and how he wishes. And a clear distinction needs to be drawn between book selection and censorship. As Leon Carnovsky said, "We must clearly distinguish between identical effects that result from altogether different causes, and we shall never face the censorship problem until we see that book selection (which implies book rejection) and censorship are not identical."[5] Book selection occurs whenever English teachers, individually or in concert select or reject a book for good and sufficient professional reasons. That one book may be rejected this year does not preclude the possibility of selecting it next year, at the discretion of the English teachers and nobody else. We need the freedom to select as we see the need in the class or in the individual student, for we select books for different reasons and for different purposes, the book for common reading being of one nature, the books for small group work of another, and the books for individual reading of still another. Ultimate judgment **must** rest with the teacher, and he should be able to defend any choice on the basis of literary and moral values, defined as the degree to which any writer succeeds in telling the truth about man in an effective and distinctive literary manner.

Censorship occurs whenever free and professional choice of books is blocked by any segment of a community, parents, church, organization, or school official. Censorship is often arbitrary and capricious, almost by definition, since virtually every book is objectionable to someone, somewhere, sometime, somehow. Rather than allow the English teacher to play his proper role with his admittedly fallible judgment, the censor enters from down right (never, of course, from down left) to play the scene with his admittedly infallible judgment. The teacher is looking for the truth, or rather the multiplicities of truth. The censor knows the truth, trumpets it forth, expects all men to share his vision, and allows no deviation from the revealed word. Good is eternally and clearly good, evil eternally and clearly evil. There is no fuzzy area between pure good and total evil, only a clearly defined line, and the censor knows precisely on which side of line anything will go. The censor has no need to question since he knows. Alfred North Whitehead once wrote, "Seek simplicity, and distrust it."[6]

---

[5]Leon Carnovsky, "The Obligations and Responsibilities of the Librarian Concerning Censorship," **The Library Quarterly**, 20 (January, 1950) page 21.

[6]Quoted in Charles Curtis and Ferris Greenslet, **The Practical Cogitator** (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953), page 51.

That is what every teacher knows and what the censor can never understand.

To deal effectively with censorship, an English teacher needs to know about (1) the history of censorship, (2) the nature of censorship and the censor, (3) the nature of literature and the purpose for teaching literature. Finally, the English teacher needs to have defenses or approaches to the censor, for without some guidelines, the English teacher will be unprepared for every attack and vulnerable to any attack.

(1) A few comments on the history of censorship. The English teacher should be aware that rational men have defended censorship on rational grounds, although I would agree that rational is often not the first word that occurs to teachers discussing censors. Plato attacked the poets because they told lies about the gods and corrupted the young, basically a moralisic defense of censorship. Hobbes viewed man's natural passions as perpetually warring against the good of the state; literature reflected man's natural passions and, therefore, highly suspect, basically a political defense of censorship. One view of freedom is predicated upon censorship. As Richard McKeon, Robert K. Merton, and Walter Gellhorn noted in their brilliant study of censorship, **The Freedom to Read: Perspective and Program:**

> Censorship and freedom are not concepts which stand in simple and unambiguous opposition to each other. On the contrary, two opposed philosophic views of freedom are held today, as in the past; and by Americans, as well as by other peoples. Freedom is conceived by some to consist in the ability to do as one pleases, whether or not one does as one ought; it is conceived by others to consist in the ability to do as one ought, whether or not one wishes to. Freedom may be defined in both views as 'absence of external constraint,' but external constraints are differently conceived according to different basic conceptions of man and the constraining influences that environ him.[7]

Another group assumes the corrupting influence of pornography on the young and suggests, reluctantly, that in this one case moral citizens should be willing to waive legal freedom to read what

---

[7]Richard McKeon, Robert K. Merton, and Walter Gellhorn, **The Freedom to Read: Perspective and Program** (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1957), pages 2-3.

they wish. Father Robert Boyle in a perceptive discussion of literature and pornography in the August 1961 **Catholic World** argues that the pornography market is booming and censorship is the answer.

> Censorship, the social means for fighting such poisonous activity, justly proceeds from all legitimate authority. The popular and sentimental fight against all censorship, a note of self-styled 'liberalism," strikes at a valuable and necessary ally of the harmony of order in human life. Authority must do what it can to protect its subjects and citizens from poison, spiritual as well as physical.[8]

(2) A few comments about the nature of censorship and censors. Censorship is likely to arise from insecurity; the world is out of joint and since each man sometimes sees himself as a Hamlet in a world gone mad, it is not difficult to understand man's temptation to step in and set the world aright. We would all prefer a more orderly world, a more compassionate mankind, a more beautiful universe. But most of us are willing to accept the world we have, all the time working to better it. We know that our private dream of Camelot should be just that, a private vision, not a universal destiny. But some men can not accept the private search for truth, particularly when the truth is so maddeningly obvious to them. Truth is clear, and why man should quest and question is utterly beyond them. Doubt leads to education and education produces doubt, and doubt is the tool of the devil. Doubt on the part of the teacher proves to the censor that his fear of books, teachers, and education generally is well founded. Reading leads to doubt, and certainty is the prerogative of the censor. C. S. Peirce observed:

> Doubt is an uneasy and dissatisfied state from which we struggle to free ourselves and pass into a state of belief; while the latter is a calm and satisfactory state which we do not wish to avoid, or to change to a belief in anything else. On the contrary, we cling tenaciously, not merely to believing, but just what we do believe.[9]

In many ways, censorship derives from a philosophy advocated by a student of mine. After struggling with his class-

---

[8]Robert Boyle (S. J.), "Literature and Pornography," **The Catholic World**, 193 (August, 1961), page 295.

[9]C. S. Peirce, "The Ways of Justifying Belief," in **The Fixation of Belief.**

mates through some selections from Plato and Aristotle and Berkeley and Descartes, among others, in an exceptional twelfth grade class, my student could take no more of our endless and pointless search for some truth. Almost bitterly he said "I don't see any point in all this stuff. I would prefer to be wrong and certain than to be endlessly looking for a truth you won't even recognize when you see it." And he's probably right about the search for truth; most of us search, but whether we will know the truth when and if we approach it is questionable. But teachers must search for the truth, and they must help students to begin their lifelong search. Of course, few students will long persist, but one or two will, and for them the journey must be free and unhampered by any censor.

Censors, like sexes, come in two varieties, the rational or philosophical, and the irrational or emotional. Unfortunately, the English teacher may sometimes blur the distinction and see any censor as irrational. In doing so, the teacher makes a monumental error, for the rational censor can discuss his point of view and he logically expects the English teacher to be able to do so. Putting aside the obvious question whether every English teacher can indeed discuss rationally and logically books he has assigned, the rational censor is to be respected and feared. But he is approachable and he can think. He often is willing to look at the teacher's point of view and the book he objects to. Wayne Booth's excellent article "Censorship and the Values of Fiction," **English Journal,** March 1964, has many ideas for meeting the rational censor.

But it is the irrational censor most of us seem to face. The irrational censor is to be feared; logic cannot sway him nor friendliness placate him. He is almost certain to be devoted to his family, highly moral, deeply religious, dedicated to his country, simplistic in his truth, and fearfully omniscient. At times he also seems to be omnipotent and omnipresent. He often sees political and moral matters in only one light, as proof positive of the international Communist conspiracy. Confucius' observation that "A man's faults all conform to his type of mind. Observe his faults and you may know his virtues,"[10] is brilliantly expressed, but I have never been able to use its wisdom in dealing with the irrational censor. His virtues are so clear, his lack of faults so manifest; my virtues so lacking, my faults so apparent. He simply

---

[10]**Analects,** IV, vii (translated by William E. Soothill, World's Classics, Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1958).

does not trust me. Peter Jennison once tried to describe the censor:

> No scientifically precise psychological profile has ever been drawn of the typical censor, but if one were, it would reveal almost equal strains of fear, insecurity, ignorance, and arrogance. The censor is prey to the disease of bibliophobia; he is afraid of books and fearful of their corrupting influence upon those more impressionable than he. He is anxious about the social and political upheavals and insecurities of the age; get rid of 'dirty' books and juvenile delinquency will disappear; get rid of books which do not assail the United Nations, and the international Communist conspiracy will wither and die. And finally, 'Big Brother' knows best what his neighbors should and should not read and buy.[11]

Most touching about the irrational censor is his deep felt belief that he is capable of reading material that will contaminate all but himself. If a book is immoral and will harm those who read it, then presumably all those who read the book will be harmed. Censors would have us believe that they can protect man from corruption without fear of personal corruption.

Whatever the defenses of censorship, there are several objections. Millet argued that "censorship in the field of literature and the other arts is usually stupid, and always unintelligent," since the critical principles of the censor are "aesthetically indefensible;" that "censorship of literature is almost invariably self-defeating" since it draws attention to the work the censor wishes to kill, and that "the censorship of literature is anti-democratic."[12] Steiner adds:

> Censorship is stupid and repugnant for two empirical reasons: censors are men no better than ourselves, their judgments no less fallible or open to dishonesty. Secondly, the thing won't work: those who really want to get hold of a book will do so somehow.[13]

---

[11]Peter S. Jennison, "Censorship: Strategy for Defense," **Publishers Weekly**, 185 (March 2, 1964), pages 58-59.

[12]Fred B. Millet, "The Vigilantes," **AAUP Bulletin**, 40 (Spring, 1954), pages 55-60.

[13]George Steiner, **Language and Silence** (New York: Atheneum, 1967), pages 74-75.

Then Steiner continues:

> This is an entirely different argument from saying that pornography doesn't in fact deprave the mind of the reader, or incite to wasteful or criminal gestures. **It may, or it may not.** We simply do not have enough evidence either way.[14]

The point raised by Steiner worried Plato as it worries modern day censors as it worries English teachers. Do books harm people? Or do books do any good? If books can harm, then censors may have a strong case. But as Steiner said, we just don't have enough evidence to be sure. The report by Dr. Marie Jahoda and the staff of New York University's Research Center for Human Relations entitled **The Impact of Literature: A Psychological Discussion of Some Assumptions in the Censorship Debate** was an attempt to offer some tentative answers. Writing a summary of the study to assist Judge Jerome Frank in the Roth case, Dr. Jahoda said:

> Persons who argue for increased censorship of printed matter often operate on the assumption that reading about sexual matters or about violence and brutality leads to anti-social actions, particularly to juvenile delinquency . . . There exists no research evidence either to prove or to disprove this assumption definitely . . . Juvenile delinquents as a group read less, and less easily then non-delinquents.
>
> The daily press, television, radio, movies, books and comics' all present their share of so-called 'bad' material . . . It is virtually impossible to isolate the impact of one of these media on a population exposed to all of them . . . As a rule, people do not expose themselves to everything that is offered, but only to what agrees with their inclinations.[15]

Spurred by legislation in the state Senate, the New Jersey Association of Teachers of English wrote psychiatrists and psychologists asking about the possible relationship between reading and adolescent behavior, especially delinquent or disturbed behavior. Although there was a distinct lack of agreement, the consensus seemed clear: most of the psychiatrists and psychologists doubted

---

[14]**Ibid.**, page 75.

[15]Quoted in David Loth, **The Erotic in Literature** (New York: Macfadden Books, 1962) page 221.

that sexually oriented reading by the young would be deleterious. Two responses make that clear.[16]

1. In your own practice, have you ever had a patient (patients) whose behavior was otherwise within a normal range, who was (were) provoked into anti-social behavior primarily as a result of exposure to sexually oriented literature?

   Yes 10 No 164

.....

3. Do you believe that the official exclusion or separation of such materials (sexually oriented) in libraries and retail stores will be beneficial in encouraging a healthy and accurate view of sex by the young person?

   Yes 25 No 159

The problem is that the censor may be right, but he has no proof save his certainty. But with the evidence available, the English teacher would be foolish to argue the point very far, one way or the other. We simply do not know, and our intuition can take us only so far, usually to the brink of disaster.

(3) A few comments about the nature of literature and the purpose for teaching literature. There are at least four objectives to teaching literature, all of them involved in the nature of literature. First, we teach literature because it can be enjoyable; second, because students can begin to understand themselves and other people vicariously; third, because students should begin to look at values and ideas of other people for purposes of contrast and challenge; and fourth, because students can grow from transitory books to literature of greater depth and maturity and sophistication. Essentially, all these points were made by T. S. Eliot when he said, "Literature should entertain, teach wisdom, and be an example of an art form."

Each of these points can be attacked by the censor. Life is earnest and not frivolous; we can know people better through living with them than through books; reality is gained through living, not through books; values are to be treasured, not disturbed; and reading is a childish activity and should be put away when a man matures.

---

[16]Sanford Clarke, "The Right to Read," **The New Jersey English Leaflet**, 28 (Winter, 1966), pages 1-8.

We will agree that the grandly philosophical view of literature as the lie can be turned against us. But literature is, after all, a lie, although a lie more significant than reality. The "real" truth about war can be found in War Department records or in personal diaries of men who fight; the "real" truth about the Depression can be found in Department of Agriculture or Department of the Interior records. Yet who among us would not argue that **Company K** or **For Whom the Bell Tolls** or **The Red Badge of Courage,** even though lies, tell more of the truth of war than any records, no matter how factual. And who would not argue that **In Dubious Battle** or **The Grapes of Wrath,** even though lies, tell more of the truth of the Depression than any record, no matter how accurate.

And we must grant that literature can be used to escape reality to enter a make believe world. All literature is an escape from our lives into the lives of others. But poor books keep us in this faery world. Good books enchant us and let us back into the real world, happier for having briefly been away from reality. Great books send us back to the real world with a deeper understanding of life, with an understanding which will not allow us to stay within the literature. With great literature (and that is what we hope to lead our students to), we become a part of the book, but the book becomes a part of us, a part to aid us in living, to make us more compassionate, to make us more aware of the nuances of life.

A literature class should be a place where students can grow, can experience, can challenge and be challenged, can look at life and not be shocked, and can relate literature to life and life to literature. Edmund Fuller, in a brilliant speech delivered at the Denver National Council meeting, talked of the English class as "The Room with a View." His thesis was that students can often see little relation between life and books they read in English class and what they enjoy reading outside. Life and English class must be related; ideally they should be nearly identical. Yet many English classes read only safe literature, only antiseptic literature, only classic and remote literature. What **Silas Marner** or **A Tale of Two Cities** or **Evangeline** say to young people is not always easily determined, but they may offer little, except to underline how hopelessly out of touch teachers often are with young people.

(4) A few comments about approaches to censorship by the teacher. Clearly, an English department should be prepared for

(*Continued on page* 18)

the onslaught of censorship; indeed, no department should be more ready for it and no department should be so well prepared to handle it. Are not English teachers by definition perceptive readers, logical debators, and skillful writers? But for those who tremble at the sound of the word censorship, here are a few suggestions.

The English Department should establish a book selection committee which will aid teachers in selecting books and in rejecting them. That should not be construed as a censorship committee. Any teacher should be allowed to advocate and teach any book he can defend before such a committee. Indeed, the fact that a teacher is asked to defend **any** book for his class, from **A Tale of Two Cities** to **Grapes of Wrath,** is good since that teacher will have to depend on something more than blind intuition. He will need to approach the book afresh, to discover what is in it, to discover what problems the book presents, and to justify whatever he does. That justification should be both oral and written, and in so doing the teacher is asked to demonstrate his taste, his methods, and his literacy. I am all in favor of such demonstrations. They might help to weed a few incompetents out of the field. And we seldom do any weeding of our professional garden.

The English Department should demonstrate professionalism before it expects the public to accept that professionalism. Too often, the English department believes, with childlike faith, that all English teachers are professional and competent. The teacher who blithely requires his students to read Steinbeck's "The Snake" or Ginsberg's "Howl" or Albee's **Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?** before his students have considerable emotional maturity is asking for trouble, and he will get it, but so will his department. When this happens, and it happens too often to be funny, everyone suffers, children, parents, and teachers.

The English department should have a carefully devised method of handling censorship cases as they arise, the two most obvious sources of help being the National Council's **The Students' Right to Read** and Booth's March 1964 **English Journal** Supplement to that little booklet. While a formal and standardized approach will assuredly not solve all problems, it will help do away with the crank and the casual objector. It will not care of the serious censor, but, after all, he deserves a hearing. English teachers make

too many mistakes to think that all attempts at censorship are without foundation.

And the English department needs to take much more seriously its obligation to the public. English department and community relations are often strained because no one in the English Department ever bothers to tell the public what is going on. The public has the right, even the duty, to be interested in their children's education, yet English teachers sometimes assume that interest is tantamount to censorship or snooping. There are friends of the English department in every community, friends who could be of tremendous help in times of crisis, if the English department would only cultivate them. Whether such cultivation takes place at PTA meetings or during Education Week or at various organization meetings (independent of the school) seems to me less important than the fact that public relations work must be done. The English department who has kept its work a secret, who lets no outsiders into the mysteries of book selection, who adamantly allows no access to departmental rituals and incantations has only itself to blame when censorship strikes and few community defenders appear. That some people in the community care enough to defend English teachers and their precious, and often private, books is a blessing and a wonder, we do so little to deserve them. We need to inform the public, if for no other reason than that it is their right to know and our obligation to inform. Teachers may badly underestimate the intelligence of the community by badly overestimating the amount of information that the community has been given about the school.

Is it necessary to add that the English teacher should keep his wits when the censor appears? In a perverse manner, the attempt at censorship can be good for the English teacher and the whole department. Censorship can and should force the teacher and department to take a close look at the whole English program, and that look will force the department and teacher to assess the merits or weaknesses of its program, of individual titles, and of its teachers. In a slightly different context, Alfred North Whitehead once said of the zealot, "The zealot gets things done. He cuts through established routine. A certain amount of zealotry is necessary to get habituated mortals out of their accustomed ruts."[17] Censorship is not an unmixed curse.

---

[17]Lucien Price (ed.), **Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead** (Boston: Little Brown, 1954), page 303.

The value of literature is the search for truth and the assessment of truths proposed by many writers, past and present. That in so searching much truth is found to be unpleasant reveals nothing of the degeneration of literature, but much about the nature and state of man. Students live with man, not the angels, and literature tells us about man's relations with man. My students have their right to follow the truth, wherever it takes them, as men have been given vision to see and write truth. If the purpose of education is to indoctrinate or adjust students into the contemporary morality of a community, then I would assume that censorship is a necessity to keep inviolate that society's values. If, however, education's role is to investigate man and truth and to battle ignorance, then censorship is a vile thing, one every teacher must oppose. Not to oppose censorship is to be derelict in the duty to students, society, and freedom.

ENGLISH for every level...

GINN ELEMENTARY ENGLISH
and
GINN SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AND COMPOSITION SERIES

GINN AND COMPANY
450 West Algonquin Road, Arlington Heights, Ill. 60005